

A FRANKS' LEMMA THAT PRESERVES INVARIANT MANIFOLDS

NIKOLAZ GOURMELON

Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux
 Université Bordeaux 1
 351, cours de la Libération
 F 33405 TALENCE cedex, FRANCE

RÉSUMÉ. D'après un célèbre lemme de John Franks, toute perturbation de la différentielle d'un difféomorphisme f le long d'une orbite périodique peut être réalisée par une C^1 -perturbation g du difféomorphisme sur un petit voisinage de ladite orbite. On n'a cependant aucune information sur le comportement des variétés invariantes de l'orbite périodique après perturbation.

Nous montrons que si la perturbation de la dérivée peut être jointe à la dérivée initiale par un chemin, et si des directions stables ou instables d'indices fixés existent le long du chemin, alors les variétés invariantes correspondantes peuvent être préservées en-dehors d'un voisinage arbitrairement petit de l'orbite. On en déduit, entre autres, une dichotomie générique entre décompositions dominées et petits angles entre directions stables et instables à l'intérieur des classes homoclines.

ABSTRACT. A well-known lemma by John Franks asserts that one can realise any perturbation of the derivative of a diffeomorphism f along a periodic orbit by a C^1 -perturbation of the whole diffeomorphism on a small neighbourhood of the orbit. However, it does not provide any information on the behaviour of the invariant manifolds of the orbit after perturbation.

In this paper we show that if the perturbed derivative can be joined from the initial derivative by a path, and if some strong stable or unstable directions of some indices exist along that path, then the corresponding invariant manifolds can be preserved outside of a small neighbourhood of the orbit. We deduce perturbative results on homoclinic classes, in particular a generic dichotomy between dominated splitting and small stable/unstable angles inside homoclinic classes.

1. Introduction. A few C^1 -specific tools and ideas are fundamental in the study the dynamics of C^1 -generic diffeomorphisms on compact manifolds, that is, diffeomorphisms of a residual subset of the set $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ of C^1 -diffeomorphisms on a Riemannian manifold M .

On the one hand, one relies on closing and connecting lemmas to create periodic points and to create homoclinic relations between them. The C^1 -Closing Lemma

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37C25, 37C29; Secondary: 37C20, 37D10.

Key words and phrases. Franks Lemma, periodic point, saddle point, linear cocycle, perturbation, stable/unstable manifold, dominated splitting, homoclinic tangency, small angles.

The author was supported by the Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne (Université de Dijon) by IMPA (Rio de Janeiro) and by the Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux (Université de Bordeaux I)..

of Pugh [12] states that a recurrent orbit can be closed by an arbitrarily small C^1 -perturbation. Using similar ideas, the connecting lemma of Hayashi [9] states that if the unstable manifold of a saddle point accumulates on a point of the stable manifold of another saddle, then a C^1 -perturbation creates a transverse intersection between the two manifolds. That was further generalized by Wen, Xia and Arnaud in [15, 1] and Bonatti and Crovisier in [2, 6], where powerful generic consequences are obtained.

On the other hand, we have tools to create dynamical patterns by C^1 -perturbations in small neighbourhoods of periodic orbit. John Franks [7] introduced a very simple lemma that allows to realise any perturbation of the derivative along a periodic orbit as a C^1 -perturbation of the whole diffeomorphism on an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of that orbit. This is the very lemma that allows to systematically reduce C^1 -perturbations along periodic orbits to linear algebra.

Other perturbation results are about generating homoclinic tangencies by C^1 -perturbations near periodic saddle points. To prove the Palis C^1 -density conjecture in dimension 2 (there is a C^1 -dense subset of diffeomorphisms of surfaces that are hyperbolic or admit a homoclinic tangency), Pujals and Sambarino [13] first show that if the dominated splitting between the stable and unstable directions of a saddle point is not strong enough, then a C^1 -perturbation of the derivative along the orbit induces a small angle between the two eigendirections. They apply the Franks' Lemma and do another perturbation to obtain a tangency between the two manifolds. In [14], Wen gave a generalization of that first step in dimension greater than 2 under similar non-domination hypothesis.

These perturbations results rely on the Franks' lemma which unfortunately fails to yield any information on the behaviour of the invariant manifolds of the periodic point. In particular, one does not control a priori what homoclinic class the periodic point will belong to, what strong connections it may have after perturbation, and it may not be possible to apply a connecting lemma in order to recreate a broken homoclinic relation.

In [8], a technique is found to preserve any fixed finite set in the invariant manifolds of a periodic point for particular types of perturbations along a periodic orbit. In particular it implies that one can create homoclinic tangencies inside homoclinic classes on which there is no stable/unstable uniform dominated splitting. This technique however is complex and difficult to adapt to other contexts.

In this paper, we provide a simple setting in which the Franks' perturbation lemma can be tamed into preserving most of the invariant manifolds of the saddle point. Let us first state the Franks' Lemma:

Lemma (Franks). *Let f be a diffeomorphism. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that, for any periodic point x of f , for any δ -perturbation $(B_1, \dots, B_p)$ of the p -uple $(A_1, \dots, A_p)$ of matrices that corresponds to the derivative Df along the orbit of x , for any neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x , one finds a C^1 ϵ -perturbation g of f on $\mathcal{U}$ that preserves the orbit of x and whose derivative along it corresponds to $(B_1, \dots, B_p)$.*

We introduce a perturbation theorem that extends the Franks' Lemma, controlling both the behaviour of the invariant manifolds of X , and the size of the C^1 -perturbation needed to obtain the derivative $(B_1, \dots, B_p)$. Precisely, we prove that if the perturbation is done by an isotopy along a path of 'acceptable derivatives', such that if the strong stable/unstable directions of some indices exist all

along along that path, then the diffeomorphism g can be chosen so that it preserves the corresponding strong stable/unstable manifolds outside of an arbitrarily small neighbourhood. Moreover, the size of the perturbation can be found arbitrarily close to the radius of the path.

In order to prove our main theorem, we will rely on the two fundamental C^r -perturbative Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. These results are stated in the next section. The two propositions are shown in section 4, and section 5 is devoted to the proof of the main theorem.

In section 6, we give examples of a few "pathwise" perturbative results on linear cocycles, to show possible applications of our main theorem. For instance, we can turn the eigenvalues of a large period saddle point to have real eigenvalues, and preserve at the same time most of its strong stable/unstable manifolds. We also deduce a generic dichotomy inside homoclinic classes between dominated splittings and small angles.

Remerciements : *Je remercie chaleureusement Flavio Abdenur, Jairo Bochi, Christian Bonatti, Sylvain Crovisier et Lorenzo Díaz pour de nombreuses discussions, suggestions et encouragements ainsi que Marcelo Viana, le CNPQ et l'IMPA (Rio de Janeiro) pour la confiance et le soutien qui m'ont été accordés dans le cadre de mon Post-Doctorat. Enfin, je remercie vivement Rafael Potrie qui m'a expliqué ses résultats, dont des utilisations inattendues du présent article.*

2. Statement of results. First recall that, given a matrix in $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ such that $|\lambda_i| < \min(|\lambda_{i+1}|, 1)$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues counted with multiplicity and ordered by increasing moduli, the i -dimensional strong stable direction is the invariant space of dimension i that corresponds to the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$. If x is a periodic point of period p for a diffeomorphism f and if the first return map Df^p admits an i -dimensional strong stable direction, then there is, inside the stable manifold of the orbit of x , a unique boundaryless i -dimensional f -invariant manifold that is tangent to that strong stable direction at x . We call it the i -strong stable manifold of the orbit of x for f . One defines symmetrically the i -strong unstable manifolds, replacing f by f^{-1} . Here is our main theorem:

Theorem 1 (A 'pathwise' Franks' lemma). *Let x be a p -periodic point for a diffeomorphism f on a Riemannian manifold M . For each $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, fix a path $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ such that the p -uple of matrices $(A_{1,0}, \dots, A_{p,0})$ corresponds to the derivative Df above the orbit of x . Then, for any sufficiently small neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x , one finds a diffeomorphism g such that it holds:*

- *the orbit of x is the same for f and g , the derivative Dg above the orbit of x corresponds to the p -uple $(A_{1,1}, \dots, A_{p,1})$, and $f = g$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$.*
- *The diffeomorphism g can be chosen so that the C^1 -distance between g and f is arbitrarily close to the maximum radius of the paths $\{A_{k,t}\}$ defined by*

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, p, t \in [0,1]} \left\{ \|A_{k,t} - A_{k,0}\|, \|A_{k,t}^{-1} - A_{k,0}^{-1}\| \right\}.$$

- *For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the following holds:*

if the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,t}$ admits an i -dimensional strong stable (unstable) direction, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, then the local i -strong stable (unstable) manifold of the orbit of x is the same for f and g outside of $\mathcal{U}$.

Where the *local i -strong stable manifold of the orbit of x outside of $\mathcal{U}$* is the set of points $x \in M \setminus \mathcal{U}$ in the i -strong stable manifold whose positive orbits enter $\mathcal{U}$ without leaving it afterwards. In other words, the perturbation g of f preserves the local strong stable/unstable manifolds outside of a neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ that may be taken arbitrarily small. One may also say that the strong stable/unstable manifolds of f and g coincide outside $\mathcal{U}$, before first return in $\mathcal{U}$. That theorem is restated in more convenient formalism in section 3.

The second half of our paper is devoted to giving examples of applications of Theorem 1. We already knew that the derivative along a saddle of large period may be perturbed in order to get real eigenvalues [2, 5], or that the derivative along a long-period saddle with a weak stable/unstable dominated splitting may be perturbed in order to get a small stable/unstable angle [4]. In section 6.4 we show that these perturbations can be obtained following 'good' paths of cocycles, in the sense that one can apply Theorem 1 to them. As a consequence, if the period of a saddle is large, then it is possible to perturb it to turn the eigenvalues of the first return map to be real, while preserving their moduli and the strong stable and unstable manifolds, outside of a small neighbourhood:

Theorem 2. *Let f be a diffeomorphism of M and $\epsilon > 0$ be a real number. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: if x is a saddle point of period $p \geq N$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the orbit of x , then there is a C^1 ϵ -perturbation g of f such that:*

- *it coincides with f along the orbit of x and outside of $\mathcal{U}$,*
- *it preserves the local strong stable/unstable manifolds of the orbit of x outside of $\mathcal{U}$,*
- *the eigenvalues of the first return map $Dg^p(x)$ are real and their moduli are the same as for f .*

Theorem 2 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 1 and Proposition 6.5. We also prove a generic dichotomy between small stable/unstable angles and stable/unstable dominated splittings within homoclinic classes, where the homoclinic class of a saddle point is the closure of the transverse intersections of its stable and unstable manifolds.

A *dominated splitting* above a compact invariant set K for a diffeomorphism f is a splitting of the tangent bundle $TM|_K = E \oplus F$ into two vector subbundles such that the vectors of E are uniformly exponentially more contracted or less expanded than the vectors of F by the iterates of the dynamics (see definition 6.1). The *index* of that dominated splitting is the dimension of E . A *saddle point* for a diffeomorphism is a hyperbolic periodic point that has non-trivial stable and unstable manifolds. The *index* of a saddle is the dimension of its stable manifold. The *stable (resp. unstable) direction* of a saddle x is the tangent vector space to the stable (resp. unstable) manifold at x . The *minimum stable/unstable angle* of a saddle x is the minimum of the angles between a vector of the stable direction of x and a vector of the unstable direction. A *residual* subset of a Baire space is a set that contains a countable intersection of open and dense subsets.

Theorem 3. *There exists a residual set $\mathcal{R} \subset \text{Diff}^1(M)$ of diffeomorphisms f such that, for any saddle point x of f , either the homoclinic class $H(x, f)$ of x admits a dominated splitting of same index as x , or, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a saddle point $y \in H(x, f)$ of same index as x such that:*

- *the minimum stable/unstable angle of y is less than ϵ ,*

- the eigenvalues of derivative of the first return map at y are all real and pairwise distinct,
- each of these eigenvalues has modulus less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} .

That result must be paralleled with [8, Theorem 1.1]. Indeed, if these three conditions are satisfied for ϵ small enough, then there are fundamental domains of the stable and unstable manifolds of y that are big before the minimal distance that separates them, in such a way that these two manifolds can be intertwined by small perturbations. In particular, it is possible to create tangencies between them by small perturbations that keep y in the homoclinic class of x .

We finally give a version of [8, Theorem 4.3] where the derivative is preserved, that is, we show that if there is weak stable/unstable dominated splitting along a saddle, and if the period of that saddle is large, then one obtains homoclinic tangency related to that saddle by a perturbation that preserves the orbit of the saddle and the derivative along it. Moreover, one may keep any preliminarily fixed finite set in the invariant manifolds of the saddle. In a very recent work, using Theorem 1, Rafael Potrie [11] got interesting results on generic Lyapunov stable and bi-stable homoclinic classes. In particular, he showed that, C^1 -generically, if H is a quasi-attractor containing a dissipative periodic point, then it admits a dominated splitting. Also, using a result by Yang [16], he proves that generically far from homoclinic tangencies if a homoclinic class is bi-Lyapunov stable (that is, the homoclinic classes that are quasi-attractors and repellers) then it is the whole manifold.

To prove Theorem 1, we will rely on three main perturbation results. Although we only use the C^1 versions to prove the theorem, they hold for any C^r -topology, $r \geq 1$. We state them here, since they may be useful in other contexts.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $r \geq 1$. Let $g_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be a sequence that converges to $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ for the C^r -topology, and let x be a saddle point of g . For any sufficiently small neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x for g , there is a neighbourhood $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x and a sequence h_k of diffeomorphisms that C^r -converges to g such that, for all k great enough, it holds:*

- $h_k = g_k$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k = g$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, if the orbit of x admits an i -dimensional strong stable (unstable) manifold for g , then the continuation of the saddle x also does for h_k , and the two corresponding local invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ both coincide.

Then we have the dual result:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $r \geq 1$. Let $g_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be a sequence that converges to $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ for the C^r -topology, and let x be a saddle point of g . For any sufficiently small neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x for g , there is a neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of the orbit of x and a sequence h_k of diffeomorphisms that C^r -converges to g such that, for all k great enough, it holds:*

- $h_k = g$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k = g_k$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, if the orbit of x admits an i -dimensional strong stable (unstable) manifold for h_k , then the continuation of the saddle x also does for g_k , and the two corresponding local invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ both coincide.

Remark 2.3. In the hypothesis of these two propositions, one may replace the fact that x is a saddle point of g by the fact that x is a periodic point for g , and that there exists a sequence $x_k \rightarrow x$ such that x_k is a periodic point for g_k of same period as x . In that case, the conclusions hold on the invariant manifolds of x for g and x_k for g_k in Proposition 2.1, and on the invariant manifolds of x for h_k , and x_k for g_k in Proposition 2.2.

Corollary 4 (Linearisation Lemma). *Let $r \geq 1$. Let x be a saddle point of a diffeomorphism $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$. Given a linear structure on the neighbourhood of each point of the orbit of x , and given a sufficiently small neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of that orbit, there is $h \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ arbitrarily C^r -close to g such that*

- $h = g$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$ and on the orbit of x ,
- it preserves the local invariant manifolds of the orbit of x outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- $Dh = Dg$ along the orbit of x , and h is linear on a neighbourhood of the orbit of x .

Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 are proved in section 4. The linearisation lemma is a straightforward consequence of the first proposition: first use unit partitions to find a sequence h_k of locally linear diffeomorphisms that tends to g , and such that $Dh_k = Dg$ on X , then apply Proposition 4.1.

3. Definitions and notations. In the following, f is a C^1 -diffeomorphism of a Riemannian manifold M of dimension d , and X is a periodic orbit for f . Let Σ be the space of linear cocycles σ on $TM|_X$ that project on $f|_X$, that is, the automorphisms of the Banach bundle $TM|_X$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TM|_X & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & TM|_X \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \pi \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & X \end{array}$$

We endow that space with the norm $\|\sigma\|_\Sigma = \sup_{\substack{v \in TM \\ \|v\|=1}} \|\sigma(v)\|$. The *eigenvalues* of a

cocycle are the eigenvalues of the first return map. When the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of a cocycle σ , counted with multiplicity and ordered by increasing moduli, satisfy $|\lambda_i| < |\lambda_{i+1}|$ and $|\lambda_i| < 1$, the *i-strong stable direction* of σ is the invariant bundle corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$. If the cocycle $\sigma = Df|_X$ has a strong stable direction of dimension i , then the *i-strong stable manifold* of X for f is the unique f -invariant, i -dimensional manifold that is tangent to that direction. The *strong unstable manifolds* for f are the strong stable manifolds for f^{-1} .

Given two finite sets I, J of positive integers, we denote by $\Sigma_{I,J}$ the set of cocycles that are bijective and have a strong stable (resp. unstable) direction of dimension i for all $i \in I$ (resp. $i \in J$). For all $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, we define the distance

$$\text{dist}(\sigma, \tau) = \max(\|\sigma - \tau\|, \|\sigma^{-1} - \tau^{-1}\|).$$

Assume that the derivative $Df|_X$ of f above X belongs to $\Sigma_{I,J}$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a neighbourhood of X . The *local i-strong stable manifold* of X for f *inside* $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of points of the i -strong stable manifold whose positive iterates remain in $\mathcal{U}$. The *local i-strong stable manifold* of X for f *outside* of $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of points y of the i -strong stable manifold for f outside of $\mathcal{U}$ whose positive orbit does not leave

$\mathcal{U}$ once it entered it. The *local strong unstable manifolds* for f are the local strong stable manifolds for f^{-1} .

Let g be a diffeomorphism such that $Dg|_X \in \Sigma_{I,J}$. We write that the *local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for f and g* if and only if, for all $(i, j) \in I \times J$, the local i -strong stable and j -strong unstable manifolds of f outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide with those of g outside of $\mathcal{U}$. Given a compact neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X , the two following statements are equivalent:

- the local stable and unstable manifolds of f inside of $\mathcal{U}$ are included in a compact disk of the stable manifold of f and a compact disk of the unstable one, respectively.
- for all y in the stable or unstable manifold of X for f , there is a positive or negative iterate $f^n(y)$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$.

If these are verified, we say that $\mathcal{U}$ is a *confined* neighbourhood of X for f .

Remark 3.1. If $\mathcal{U}$ is confined for f , then it is confined for any C^1 -neighbouring g such that $g|_X = f|_X$. If $\mathcal{U}$ is sufficiently small, i.e. the hausdorff distance from $\mathcal{U}$ to X is sufficiently small, then $\mathcal{U}$ is confined for f .

Using the second characterization of confinement and working in a compact neighbourhood of X , since the stable and unstable manifolds vary continuously by C^1 -perturbations of the dynamics, one gets the first affirmation of the remark. The second affirmation is obvious. With this remark, Theorem 1 is a straightforward consequence of the following:

Theorem 5. *Assume that $Df|_X$ is in $\Sigma_{I,J}$ and let $\gamma = (\gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ be a path in $\Sigma_{I,J}$ such that $\gamma_0 = Df|_X$. Then, for any confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for f , for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a diffeomorphism g such that*

- $Dg|_X = \gamma_1$, and $g = f$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for f and g ,
- the C^1 -distance between g and f is less than $r(\gamma) + \epsilon$, where

$$r(\gamma) = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_t).$$

We say that $r(\gamma)$ is the *radius* of the path γ .

4. Proof of the perturbation propositions 2.1 and 2.2. In this section X is again the orbit of a periodic point of the diffeomorphism f , and $\Sigma_{I,J}$ is defined as in section 3. To prove the perturbation propositions, it suffices to prove the two following ones, for any pair (I, J) of finite sets in $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$:

Proposition 4.1 ($\mathcal{P}_{I,J}$). *Let $g_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be a sequence that converges to $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ for the C^r -topology, with $Dg|_X$ and $Dg_k|_X$ in $\Sigma_{I,J}$. For any confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for g , there exists neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of X and a sequence of diffeomorphisms h_k that converges to g such that, for all k great enough, it holds:*

- $h_k = g_k$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k = g$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for g and h_k .

Proposition 4.2 ($\mathcal{P}'_{I,J}$). *Let $g_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be a sequence that converges to $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ for the C^r -topology, with $Dg|_X$ and $Dg_k|_X$ in $\Sigma_{I,J}$. For any confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for g , there exists neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}$ of X and a sequence of diffeomorphisms h_k that converges to g such that, for k great enough, it holds:*

- $h_k = g$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k = g_k$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for g_k and h_k .

Propositions 2.1, 2.2 and Remark 2.3 are straightforward consequences. Indeed, the only problem is that, in Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.3, the orbit of g_k we are interested in is not X but some p -periodic orbit X_k , where the sequence X_k tends to X . But then, one may conjugate each g_k by some $\phi_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ that is equal to Id outside of $\mathcal{U}$ and that sends X_k on X , and assume that ϕ_k converges to Id for the C^r -topology. Thus, one may assume that $X_k = X$.

Proof of $\mathcal{P}_{\emptyset, \emptyset}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{\emptyset, \emptyset}$: these are slightly refined versions of Franks' Lemma. It is enough to take a unit partition $\mu + \nu = 1$ on M such that $\mu = 1$ outside of a small neighbourhood of X and $\mu = 0$ in a smaller neighbourhood. Then follow the proof of Franks' Lemma. $\square$

Given two finite sets I, J of strictly positive integers, if they exist, let i_0 and j_0 be the least integers in I and J , respectively, and let $I^* = I \setminus \{i_0\}$ and $J^* = J \setminus \{j_0\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *For any subsets $I, J \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $J \neq \emptyset$, Proposition $\mathcal{P}(I, J^*)$ implies Proposition $\mathcal{P}(I, J)$.*

Lemma 4.4. *For any subsets $I, J \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $J \neq \emptyset$, Proposition $\mathcal{P}'(I, J^*)$ implies Proposition $\mathcal{P}'(I, J)$.*

By symmetry of statements, changing the dynamics to the inverse dynamics, we also have that $\mathcal{P}(I^*, J)$ implies $\mathcal{P}(I, J)$, and $\mathcal{P}'(I^*, J)$ implies $\mathcal{P}'(I, J)$. By induction, this implies Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 for all $I, J \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. We are left to prove Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4.

4.1. Technical prerequisite: regular neighbourhoods. We state in this section two useful technical lemmas. Let $g \in \text{Diff}(M)$ such that $Dg|_X \in \Sigma_{I, J}$. Let i_m and j_m be the maximum integers of I and J . Given a confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for g , we say that a compact neighbourhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ of X is *regular for $(g, \mathcal{U})$* if and only if

- the local i_m -strong stable manifold $\mathcal{V}_g^s$ of g inside $\mathcal{V}$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{V}$ and the local i_m -strong stable manifold of g inside $\mathcal{U}$,
- the local j_m -strong unstable manifold $\mathcal{V}_g^u$ of g inside $\mathcal{V}$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{V}$ and the local j_m -strong unstable manifold of g inside $\mathcal{U}$.

Since $\mathcal{U}$ is confined for g , by a compactness argument, one finds a neighbourhood Λ of g in the set of C^r -diffeomorphisms h such that $h|_X = g|_X$ and two families $\{\mathcal{D}_h^u\}_{h \in \Lambda}$ and $\{\mathcal{D}_h^s\}_{h \in \Lambda}$ such that

- $\mathcal{D}_h^u$ and $\mathcal{D}_h^s$ are two subdisks of the i_m -strong stable and j_m -strong unstable manifolds of X for h , respectively, and both vary C^r -continuously with $h \in \Lambda$.
- they contain the local i_m -strong stable and j_m -strong unstable manifolds of X for h inside $\mathcal{U}$, respectively.

Hence we easily deduce the following:

Lemma 4.5. *Let $g \in \text{Diff}(M)$ such that $Dg|_X \in \Sigma_{I, J}$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a confined neighbourhood of X for g . There is an arbitrarily small neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}$ of X that is regular for any neighbouring pair $(h, \mathcal{U}')$ of $(g, \mathcal{U})$, where $\mathcal{U}'$ is close to $\mathcal{U}$ for the Hausdorff topology.*

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a confined neighbourhood of X for g . The *first i -strong stable fundamental domain outside of $\mathcal{U}$* is the first fundamental domain $g^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_g^{s,i}) \setminus \mathcal{U}_g^{s,i}$ of the local i -strong stable manifold $\mathcal{U}_g^{s,i}$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$. Symmetrically, the *first j -strong unstable fundamental domain outside of $\mathcal{U}$* is the first fundamental domain $g(\mathcal{U}_g^{u,j}) \setminus \mathcal{U}_g^{u,j}$ of the local j -strong unstable manifold $\mathcal{U}_g^{u,j}$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$.

Remark 4.6. Let $g, h \in \text{Diff}(M)$ such that $Dg|_X, Dh|_X \in \Sigma_{I,J}$ and such that $g = h$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$. Then the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for g and h if and only if the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $g, h \in \text{Diff}(M)$ such that $Dg|_X, Dh|_X \in \Sigma_{I,J}$ and let $\mathcal{U}$ be a confined neighbourhood of X for g . Let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ be a regular neighbourhood of X for $(g, \mathcal{U})$ such that $g = h$ by restriction to $M \setminus \mathcal{V}$. If the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}$ coincide for g and h , then the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{U}$ also coincide.*

Equivalently, if the local (I, J) -strong stable manifolds outside of $\mathcal{V}$ coincide for g and h , then the local (I, J) -strong stable manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ also coincide.

Proof. Let $i \in I$. Let x be a point in the first i -strong unstable fundamental domain for g outside of $\mathcal{V}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be its orbit by g , with $x_0 = x$. Then the negative orbit $(x_n)_{n < 0}$ is entirely in $\mathcal{V}$. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is regular, $\mathcal{V}_g^u$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{V}$ with the local j_m -strong unstable manifold of g inside $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore, as $\mathcal{U}$ is confined for g , there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the points $(x_n)_{0 \leq n < k}$ are in $\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{V}$, with $x_k \notin \mathcal{U}$. Let $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be the orbit of the point $x = y_0$ by h . Obviously, as $g = h$ outside of $\mathcal{V}$, the iterates x_n and y_n coincide for $0 \leq n \leq k$. Since $y_0 = x$ is in the first i -strong unstable fundamental domain for g outside $\mathcal{V}$, in particular in $h(\mathcal{V}_h^u)$, the negative orbit $(y_n)_{n < 0}$ is entirely in $\mathcal{V}$. Hence, $x_k = y_k$ is in the first i -strong unstable fundamental domain outside of $\mathcal{U}$ for g and for h .

Since the first i -strong unstable fundamental domain outside of $\mathcal{V}$ for g is also the one for h , the first i -strong unstable fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide entirely for g and h . One does the symmetric reasoning on the stable manifolds. The equivalent statement is straightforward from Remark 4.6. $\square$

4.2. Painfully technical part: proof of Lemma 4.3. We assume $\mathcal{P}(I, J^*)$. Let $g_k \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ be a sequence that converges to $g \in \text{Diff}^r(M)$ for the C^r -topology, with $Dg|_X$ and $Dg_k|_X$ in $\Sigma_{I,J}$ for all k , and let $\mathcal{U}$ be a confined neighbourhood for g . Let i_m and j_m be the maximum integers of I and J respectively. By the previous section, one finds a neighbourhood Λ of g in the set of C^r -diffeomorphisms h such that $h|_X = g|_X$ and two families $\{\mathcal{D}_h^u\}_{h \in \Lambda}$ and $\{\mathcal{D}_h^s\}_{h \in \Lambda}$ such that

- (i) $\mathcal{D}_h^u$ and $\mathcal{D}_h^s$ are two subdisks of the i_m -strong stable and j_m -strong unstable manifolds of X for h , respectively, and both vary C^r -continuously with $h \in \Lambda$.
- (ii) they contain the local i_m -strong stable and j_m -strong unstable manifolds of X for h inside $\mathcal{U}$, respectively.

In the following, j_0 is the least integer of J . Choosing the neighbourhood Λ small enough, one finds a neighbourhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ of X for g that identifies to $\{1, \dots, p\} \times [-5, 5]^d$ by a C^r -diffeomorphism, in such a manner that:

- (iii) X identifies to $\{1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.
- (iv) $\mathcal{V}_g^u = \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{D}_g^u$ and $\mathcal{V}_g^s = \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{D}_g^s$ are compact submanifolds with boundary that vary C^r -continuously with $h \in \Lambda$, with

$$\mathcal{V}_g^u = \{1, \dots, p\} \times [-5, 5]^{j_m} \times \{0\}^{d-j_m},$$

$$\mathcal{V}_g^s = \{1, \dots, p\} \times \{0\}^{d-i_m} \times [-5, 5]^{i_m}.$$

- (v) h sends $\mathcal{V}_h^s$ in the interior of $\mathcal{V}_h^s$ and h^{-1} sends $\mathcal{V}_h^u$ in the interior of $\mathcal{V}_h^u$.
- (vi) for all $j \in J^*$, the union of disks $\mathcal{V}_g^{u,j} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times [-5, 5]^j \times \{0\}^{d-j}$ is the local j -strong unstable manifold of X for g in $\mathcal{V}$.
- (vii) For $r = 3, 4, 5$, the sets

$$\{1\} \times ([-r, r]^{j_m} \setminus [-r+1, r-1]^{j_m}) \times \{0\}^{d-j_m},$$

are fundamental domains of the local j_m -strong stable manifold for g in $\mathcal{V}$.

- (viii) Denoting by $\mathcal{B}_r$, for $r = 3, 4, 5$, the thickened rings

$$\{1\} \times ([-r, r]^{j_0} \setminus [-r+1, r-1]^{j_0}) \times [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0} \times [-1, 1]^{d-j_1}$$

in $\mathcal{V}$ around the fundamental domains

$$\{1\} \times ([-r, r]^{j_0} \setminus [-r+1, r-1]^{j_0}) \times \{0\}^{j_1-j_0} \times \{0\}^{d-j_1}$$

of the j_0 -strong stable manifold for g , the first return map g^p induces by restriction a diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{B}_4$ to $\mathcal{B}_5$ and a diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{B}_3$ to $\mathcal{B}_4$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_4 \\ g^p(1, a, b, c) = (1, \mathcal{S}(a), b, c), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is a diffeomorphism from $[3, 3]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}$ to $[-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-3, 3]^{j_0}$.

Claim 1. *If the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds for $h_0, h_1 \in \Lambda$ coincide outside of $\mathcal{V}$, and if $h_0 = h_1$ outside of $\mathcal{V}$, then these manifolds coincide outside of $\mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. Indeed (i), (ii) and (v) imply that $\mathcal{V}_h^s$ and $\mathcal{V}_h^u$ are the local i_m/j_m strong stable/unstable manifolds of h inside $\mathcal{V}$, and imply in particular that $\mathcal{V}$ is regular for $(g, \mathcal{U})$. Apply then Lemma 4.7. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{W} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times [-2, 2]^d$. We will now apply $\mathcal{P}(I, J^*)$ with the neighbourhood $\mathcal{W}$ and then do small perturbations on $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_3 \cup \mathcal{B}_4$ in order to bring the j_0 -strong unstable manifold where we want it to be. By $\mathcal{P}(I, J^*)$, there is a neighbourhood $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{W}$ of X sequence of diffeomorphisms h_k^* that converges for the C^r topology to g such that, for k great enough,

- $h_k^* = g_k$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k^* = g$ outside of $\mathcal{W}$,
- the local (I, J^*) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{W}$ coincide for g and h_k^* .

Claim 2. *Let Φ be a diffeomorphism of M such that, for all $j \in J^*$, Φ leaves invariant the fundamental domains*

$$\{1\} \times ([-r, r]^j \setminus [-r+1, r-1]^j) \times \{0\}^{d-j}, \text{ for } r = 3, 4,$$

of the j -strong unstable manifold of g , and assume that Φ is equal to Id outside of $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_3 \cup \mathcal{B}_4$. Then, for k great enough, the (I, J^) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{V}$ coincide for h_k^* and $h_k^* \circ \Phi$.*

Proof. For k great enough, the aforementioned fundamental domains are also fundamental domains of the local j -strong unstable manifolds $\mathcal{V}_{h_k^*}^{u,j}$ of h_k^* inside $\mathcal{V}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{B}$ does not intersect the rest of the local j -strong unstable manifolds of h_k^* inside $\mathcal{V}$ nor the local i_m -strong stable manifolds for h_k^* inside $\mathcal{V}$. $\square$

We will now build a diffeomorphism Φ that matches the conditions of this claim, and that pushes the j_0 -strong stable for h_k^* to coincide with that for g outside of $\mathcal{U}$. Let j_1 be the least integer in J^* . If J^* is empty, then let $j_1 = d$. One deduces:

- (ix) for k great enough, there is a C^r -map $\psi_k: [-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0}$ such that the intersection of the local j_0 -strong unstable manifold of h_k^* and $\mathcal{B} = \{1\} \times ([-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}) \times [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0} \times [-1, 1]^{d-j_1}$ is the image of

$$\zeta_k: \begin{cases} [-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0} & \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \\ a & \mapsto (1, a, \psi_k(a), 0) \end{cases}.$$

- (x) For all $a \in [-3, 3]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}$, we have $\zeta_k(\mathcal{S}(a)) = (1, \mathcal{S}(a), \psi_k(a), 0)$.
 (xi) The sequence of applications $(\psi_k: [-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ tends to 0 for the C^r topology.

Indeed, by (vi) (for $j = j_1$) and since the local j_1 -strong unstable manifolds coincide outside of $\mathcal{W}$ for g and h_k^* , the intersection of $\mathcal{B}$ and the local j_0 -strong unstable manifolds for h_k^* outside of $\mathcal{W}$ has to be in $\{1\} \times ([-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}) \times [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0} \times \{0\}^{d-j_1}$. Using again (vi) for $j = j_0$, and the fact that the local j_1 -strong unstable manifold for h_k^* converges for the C^r -topology to that for g , one finally gets (ix) and (xi). Item (x) is a straightforward consequence of (viii).

Let $\rho + \sigma = 1$ be a unit partition on $[-3, 3]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}$ such that $\rho = 0$ on a neighbourhood of $[-2, 2]^{j_0}$ and $\rho = 1$ on a neighbourhood of $[-3, 3]^{j_0}$. Define

$$\xi_k: \begin{cases} [-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0} \\ a \mapsto -\rho(a) \cdot \psi_k(a) \\ \mathcal{S}(a) \mapsto -\sigma(a) \cdot \psi_k(a) \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } a \in [-3, 3]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}$$

Thanks to another unit partition, one builds a sequence of diffeomorphism $\widetilde{\Phi}_k$ of $\mathcal{B}$ that tends to the identity map $Id_{\mathcal{B}}$, that are equal to $Id_{\mathcal{B}}$ on a neighbourhood of the boundary of $\mathcal{B}$ and such that, for k great enough,

$$\forall (b, c, d) \in ([-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0}) \times [-1, 1]^{j_1-j_0} \times [-1, 1]^{d-j_1},$$

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_k(1, b, c, d) = (1, b, c - \theta_k(b, c, d), d),$$

with $\theta_k(b, c, d) = \xi_k(b)$ on $[-4, 4]^{j_0} \setminus [-2, 2]^{j_0} \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{j_1-j_0} \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-j_1}$. Define the diffeomorphism $\Phi_k: M \rightarrow M$ as the extension by Id of $\widetilde{\Phi}_k$. Then Φ_k satisfies all the hypothesis of Claim 2, therefore the local (I, J^*) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{V}$ coincide for h_k^* and $h_k = h_k^* \circ \Phi_k$. Moreover, for k great enough, the local j_0 -unstable manifold for $h_k = h_k^* \circ \Phi_k$ inside $\mathcal{V}$ coincides with that for g on $\mathcal{B}_5$, which is the thickening of the fundamental domain $\{1\} \times ([-5, 5]^{j_0} \setminus [-4, 4]^{j_0}) \times \{0\}^{d-j_0}$ of the j_0 -strong unstable manifold inside $\mathcal{V}$ for g and for h_k . Since the positive orbit of any $x \in \mathcal{B}_5$ is the same for h_k and g until it goes out of $\mathcal{V}$, the first j_0 -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}$ coincide for h_k and g . This, by Lemma 4.7 and the regularity of $\mathcal{V}$ for $(g, \mathcal{U})$, implies that the local j_0 -strong stable manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for g and h_k . Note that the hypothesis of Claim 1 are also satisfied by g and h_k . Therefore, for k great enough,

- $h_k = g_k$ on $\mathcal{O}$,
- $h_k = g$ outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds coincide outside of $\mathcal{U}$ for g and h_k .

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.3.

4.3. Sketch of a proof of Lemma 4.4. We only sketch it since it is very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3. As previously, we first find a neighbourhood Λ such that items (i) and (ii) are satisfied, then a neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}$ and local coordinates $\phi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, p\} \times [-5, 5]^d$ such that items (iii) to (viii) are satisfied. Notice that the pair $(\mathcal{V}, \phi)$ is somehow adapted to the diffeomorphism g . Here we build a sequence $(\mathcal{V}_k, \phi_k)$ of neighbourhoods and local coordinates that converges C^r -uniformly to $(\mathcal{V}, \phi)$, such that each pair $(\mathcal{V}_k, \phi_k)$ is adapted to g_k in the sense that it satisfies the items (i) to (viii), when g is replaced by g_k .

One has then a sequence $\mathcal{B}_k$ of boxes that converges C^r -uniformly to the box $\mathcal{B}$ corresponding to the pair $(\mathcal{V}, \phi)$. One applies the induction hypothesis to get a sequence h_k^* that preserves the (I, J^*) -invariant manifolds of g_k outside of $\mathcal{V}_k$. The same way as in the previous section, for k great enough we can perturb h_k^* on $\mathcal{B}_k$ into h_k , pushing its j_0 -strong unstable manifold on that of g_k .

It is easily checked that, since $\mathcal{B}_k$ converges to $\mathcal{B}$ and h_k^* converges to g for the C^r -topology, the size of the perturbation tends to zero. Therefore the sequence h_k tends to g . This ends our sketch of the proof of Lemma 4.4.

5. Proof of Theorem 5. We fix a family of charts $\{\phi_x: B_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d\}_{x \in X}$, where the sets B_x are pairwise disjoint compact balls such that each B_x contains x in its interior, and where $\phi_x(B_x)$ is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\phi_x(x) = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the union of the balls B_x . We endow $\mathcal{C}$ with the corresponding canonical linear structure and Euclidean metric and we endow $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ with a Riemannian metric that extends that Euclidean metric.

For any set $K \subset \mathcal{C}$ and any $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, we define $\lambda.K$ as the union of the sets $\lambda.(K \cap B_x)$, for $x \in X$. The map $\lambda.Id: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is the diffeomorphism that restricts on each B_x to the homothety of ratio λ . Each cocycle $\sigma \in \Sigma_{I,J}$ canonically identifies to a linear diffeomorphism $\sigma: \mathcal{C}_\sigma^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\sigma^{-1}$, where $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^k$ is the set of points $x \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the iterate $\sigma^k(x)$ is well-defined. Let E_σ^s (resp. E_σ^u) be the intersection of $\mathcal{C}$ and the vector spaces that correspond to the i_m -strong stable (resp. j_m -strong unstable) directions of σ , where i_m and j_m are the maximum integers of I and J .

For all $k > 0$, define $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^{k,s} = E_\sigma^s \cap \mathcal{C}_\sigma^k$ and $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^{k,u} = E_\sigma^u \cap \mathcal{C}_\sigma^k$. Then the sequences $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma^{k,s})_{k \geq 1}$ and $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma^{k,u})_{k \geq 1}$ are constant after some iterates n and m , respectively. Let

$$\mathcal{V}_\sigma = \bigcap_{-m \leq k \leq n} \sigma^k(\mathcal{C}_\sigma^k).$$

Note that the neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ of X is the disjoint union of compact convex balls $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,x}$, for $x \in X$, where x is in the interior of $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma,x}$. One naturally defines the local (I, J) -strong stable/unstable manifolds for σ inside $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$. In particular, the local i_m -strong stable manifold $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^s$ for σ inside $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ and E_σ^s (this is a priori not the case for $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$). This also holds for $\lambda.\mathcal{V}_\sigma$, for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, and the symmetrical statement holds for the local j_m -strong unstable manifold $\mathcal{V}_\sigma^u$. Since $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ is a subset of both $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$ and $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^{-1}$, the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ (see section 4.1) are well-defined for σ .

Remark 5.1. For any diffeomorphism g such that $g = \sigma$ on a neighbourhood of X , and for any confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for g , if $\lambda \geq 0$ is small enough, then the neighbourhood $\lambda.\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ is regular for $(g, \mathcal{U})$.

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a closed neighbourhood of X included in the interior of $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$. If a diffeomorphism g of M satisfies $g = \sigma$ outside $\mathcal{W}$ (that is, by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1 \setminus \mathcal{W}$), then one can locally conjugate it by a homothety as follows: for any

$1 \leq \lambda < \infty$ we denote by g_λ the diffeomorphism of M such that $g_\lambda = g$ outside of $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$, $g_\lambda = \sigma$ by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1 \setminus \lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{W}$, and

$$g_\lambda = \lambda^{-1} \cdot Id \circ g \circ \lambda \cdot Id$$

by restriction to $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{W}$. We denote by g_∞ the diffeomorphism such that $g_\infty = g$ outside of $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$ and $g_\infty = \sigma$ by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$.

Remark 5.2. The C^1 -distance from g_λ to g_∞ , that is, the C^1 -distance from $g_{\lambda|\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1}$ to σ , is a decreasing function of $1 \leq \lambda \leq \infty$.

Definition 5.3. Given $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, we say that a diffeomorphism g of M is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ if it holds:

- g is equal to τ on a neighbourhood of X ,
- there is a neighbourhood $\mathcal{W}$ of X inside the interior of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ such that $g = \sigma$ on $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1 \setminus \mathcal{W}$,
- the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ coincide for g and σ .

Remark 5.4. If g is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ , then the three points of the definition are also hold replacing g and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ by g_λ and $\lambda^{-1} \mathcal{V}_\sigma$, for any $1 \leq \lambda \leq \infty$.

Claim 3. If g is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ and g' is an (I, J) -connection from τ to ρ , then there is an (I, J) -connection g'' from σ to ρ such that one has the following inequality on the C^1 -distances:

$$\text{dist}(g''|_{\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1}, \sigma) \leq \text{dist}(g|_{\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1}, \sigma) + \text{dist}(g'|_{\mathcal{C}_\tau^1}, \tau)$$

Proof. By Remark 5.1, there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{V}_\tau$ is a regular neighbourhood for $(g, \mathcal{V}_\sigma)$ and such that g is equal to τ on $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{C}_\tau^1$. Build g'' such that $g'' = g$ outside of $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{C}_\tau^1$ and $g'' = g'_\lambda$ on $\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{C}_\tau^1$. Using Remark 5.4 and Lemma 4.7, one gets that the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ coincide for g'' and σ . Hence, g'' is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ .

By Remark 5.2, the C^1 -distance from τ to $g'_{\lambda|\lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{C}_\tau^1}$ is less or equal to the C^1 -distance from τ to $g'_{|\mathcal{C}_\tau^1}$. The distance inequality is straightforward. $\square$

We define (I, J) -quasidistance from σ to $\tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$ as the infimum of the distances $\text{dist}(g|_{\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1}, \sigma)$, where g is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ . This is indeed a quasidistance (with values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, *a priori*¹) in the sense that it is separate and satisfies the triangle inequality: by claim 3, for all $\sigma, \tau, \rho \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, one has

$$d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \rho) \leq d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \tau) + d_{I,J}(\tau \rightarrow \rho).$$

Lemma 5.5. For all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a neighbourhood $\Omega \subset \Sigma_{I,J}$ of σ such that the quasidistance $d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \tau)$ is less than ϵ , for any $\tau \in \Omega$.

Proof. Let σ_k be a sequence that tends to σ in $\Sigma_{I,J}$. We have to show that for all k great enough, the quasidistance $d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \sigma_k)$ tends to 0. Let g be a diffeomorphism of M that coincides with σ on $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$. By a unit partition we build a sequence g_k of diffeomorphisms that tends to g , such that $g_k = \sigma_k$ on a neighbourhood X . By Remark 5.1, there is a closed neighbourhood $\mathcal{W}$ of X included in the interior of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ and regular for $(g, \mathcal{V}_\sigma)$. The neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ of X being confined for g , we apply Proposition 4.3 to find a sequence h_k that tends to g such that, for k great enough,

¹Recent discussions with J. Bochi and C. Bonatti suggest there exists an (I, J) -connection between two cocycles $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, if and only if σ and τ act the same way on the orientations of their respective (I, J) -invariant directions.

- $Dh_k = \sigma_k$ on a neighbourhood of X ,
- $h_k = \sigma$ by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1 \setminus \mathcal{W}$,
- the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{W}$ coincide for g and h_k , which, by Lemma 4.7 and Remark 4.6 implies that the first (I, J) -fundamental domains outside of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$ coincide for h_k and σ .

Hence, for k great enough, h_k is an (I, J) -connection from σ to τ , and the C^1 distance from $h_k|_{\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1}$ to $g|_{\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1} = \sigma$ tends to 0. So does the quasidistance $d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \tau_k)$. $\square$

Lemma 5.6. *For all $\tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a neighbourhood $\Omega \subset \Sigma_{I,J}$ of τ such that, for any $\sigma \in \Omega$, the quasidistance $d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \tau)$ is less than ϵ .*

Proof. Here we prove that the quasidistance $d_{I,J}(\sigma_k \rightarrow \sigma)$ tends to zero. We find a sequence of diffeomorphisms g_k that tends to g such that $g_k = \sigma_k$ by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_k}^1$ and $g = \sigma$ by restriction to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$. Note that the sequence $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_k}^1$ tends to $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^1$ and the sequence $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma_k}$ tends to $\mathcal{V}_\sigma$. By Lemma 4.5, there is an arbitrarily small neighbourhood $\mathcal{W}$ of X such that it is regular for all the pairs $(g_k, \mathcal{V}_{\sigma_k})$, where k great enough. Then apply Proposition 4.4 and conclude as in the previous proof. $\square$

For all $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{I,J}$, we define the distance $d_{I,J}(\sigma, \tau)$ to be the infimum of $d_{I,J}(\sigma \rightarrow \tau)$ and $d_{I,J}(\tau \rightarrow \sigma)$. As a direct consequence of Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6, we have

Lemma 5.7. *The metric $d_{I,J}$ is compatible with the topology on $\Sigma_{I,J}$ defined by the metric dist in section 3.*

Proof of Theorem 5. Choose a path γ as in the assumptions of the theorem and fix $\epsilon > 0$ and a confined neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of X for f . Let $r(\gamma)$ be the radius of the path. By compactness of the path and Lemma 5.7, we find a sequence $\{\sigma_k\}_{k=1,\dots,n}$, such that $\sigma_1 = \gamma(0) = Df|_X$ and $\sigma_n = \gamma(1)$, and such that the distance $d_{I,J}(\sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1})$ is strictly less than $\epsilon/2$, for all $0 \leq k \leq n-1$.

By the linearisation lemma (Corollary 4 in section 2), we find an $\epsilon/2$ -perturbation f_1 of $f = f_0$ on $\mathcal{U}$ of X such that $f_1 = \sigma_1$ on a neighbourhood of X , and such that the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for f and f_0 . By Remark 5.1, for $\lambda_1 > 1$ great enough, $\mathcal{U}_1 = \lambda_1^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\sigma_1}$ is confined for $(f_1, \mathcal{U})$ and $f_1 = \sigma_1$ on $\mathcal{U}_1$. Since $d_{I,J}(\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2) \leq d_{I,J}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) < \epsilon/2$, one finds an (I, J) -connection g_2 from σ_1 to σ_2 such that

$$\text{dist}(g_2|_{\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}^1}, \sigma_2) < \epsilon/2.$$

Then define f_2 such that $f_2 = g_2|_{\mathcal{U}_1}$ inside $\mathcal{U}_1 = \lambda_1^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{V}_{\sigma_1}$, and $f_2 = f_1$ outside of $\mathcal{U}_1$. By Remark 5.4 and Lemma 4.7, the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for f_1 and f_2 . Besides, the C^1 -distance between f_2 and σ_2 by restriction to $\mathcal{U}_1$ is less than ϵ .

Hence, by induction, one builds a sequence $(f_k)_{k=1,\dots,n}$ of diffeomorphisms and a sequence $\mathcal{U}_1 \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{U}_{n-1} \supset \mathcal{U}_n$ such that the local (I, J) -invariant manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$ coincide for f and f_k , such that $f_{k+1} = f_k$ outside $\mathcal{U}_k$, and such that the C^1 -distance between f_k and σ_k is less than $\epsilon/2$, by restriction to $\mathcal{U}_k$. Choosing $\mathcal{U}_1$ (that is λ_1) small enough, this implies that the C^1 -distance between f_k and f_1 is less than $r(\gamma) + \epsilon/2$. Thus, the distance between f_n and f is less than $r(\gamma) + \epsilon$. Thus we conclude the proof of Theorem 5 taking $g = f_n$. $\square$

6. Examples of applications. We give in this section a few consequences of Theorem 1. We prove Theorem 2 which says that one can perturb a saddle of large period in order to turn its eigenvalues real, while preserving its strong invariant manifolds outside of an arbitrarily small neighbourhood. Wen [14] showed that the absence of a dominated splitting of index i on limit sets of periodic orbits of same index allows to create homoclinic tangencies by small perturbations. To prove it, he showed that one obtains new saddles with small stable/unstable angles by C^1 -perturbations, but a priori without knowledge of the homoclinic class to which the new saddles belong. Here we prove Theorem 3, which gives a dichotomy between small angles and dominated splittings within homoclinic classes. Through that result, we find another way to the main theorem of [8], and a more complete result.

6.1. Dichotomy between small angles and dominated splittings. We recall that a saddle point x is *homoclinically related* to another y if and only if the unstable manifold of each meets somewhere transversally the stable manifold of the other. The *homoclinic class* of a saddle x is the closure of the saddles that are homoclinically related to x . The *eigenvalues* of a saddle x are the eigenvalues of the derivative of the first return map at x .

Definition 6.1. Let f be a diffeomorphism of M and K be a compact invariant set. A splitting $TM|_K = E \oplus F$ of the tangent bundle above K into two Df -invariant vector subbundles of constant dimensions is a *dominated splitting* if there exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any point $x \in K$, for any unit vectors $u \in E_x$ and $v \in F_x$ in the fibers of E and F above x , respectively, one has:

$$\|Df^N(u)\| < 1/2 \cdot \|Df^N(v)\|.$$

In that case, we say the splitting is *N -dominated*. The smaller the number N , the stronger the domination. Theorem 3 is a generic consequence of the following proposition (see section 6.2).

Proposition 6.2. *Let f be a diffeomorphism of M and $\epsilon > 0$ be a real number. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if x is a saddle point of period greater than N and its corresponding stable/unstable splitting is not N -dominated, if $\mathcal{U}$ is a neighbourhood of the orbit of x then*

- *there is a C^1 ϵ -perturbation g of f that coincides with f along the orbit of x and outside of $\mathcal{U}$, that preserves the local strong stable/unstable manifolds of x outside of $\mathcal{U}$,*
- *the minimum stable/unstable angle for g of some iterate $g^k(x)$ is less than ϵ ,*
- *the eigenvalues of the saddle x for g are real, pairwise distinct, and each of them has modulus less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} .*

The proof of Proposition 6.2 is postponed until section 6.4.

Theorem 4.3 in [8] states that if the stable/unstable dominated splitting along a saddle is weak enough, then one may find a C^1 -perturbation that creates a homoclinic tangency related to that saddle, while preserving a finite number of points in the strong stable/unstable manifolds of that saddle. During the process, the derivative of that saddle may have been modified. The technique introduced in this paper allows to create a tangency while preserving the derivative.

Indeed, under the hypothesis that there is a weak stable/unstable dominated splitting for some saddle x , one creates a small stable/unstable angle and pairwise

distinct real eigenvalues of moduli less than $1/2$ or greater than 2 , after changing the derivative by application of Theorem 1 with some path γ of derivatives (see the proof of Proposition 6.2 in section 6.4). Applying the techniques of the proof of [8, Proposition 5.1], one finds another small C^1 -perturbation on an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of x that creates a tangency between its stable and unstable manifolds, without modifying the dynamics on a (smaller) neighbourhood of the orbit of x . That perturbation can be done preserving any preliminarily fixed finite set inside the strong stable or unstable manifolds of x . Then one may come back to the initial derivative applying again Theorem 1 with the backwards path γ^{-1} . This sums up into:

Theorem 6. *Let f be a diffeomorphism of M and $\epsilon > 0$ be a real number. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if x is a saddle point of period greater than N and its corresponding stable/unstable splitting is not N -dominated, if $\mathcal{U}$ is a neighbourhood of the orbit of x and $\Gamma \subset M$ is a finite set, then*

- *there is a C^1 ϵ -perturbation g of f that coincides with f along the orbit of x and outside of $\mathcal{U}$, such that the saddle x admits a homoclinic tangency inside $\mathcal{U}$ for g .*
- *the derivatives Df and Dg coincide along the orbit of x ,*
- *for each $y \in \Gamma$, if y is in the strong stable (resp. unstable) manifold of dimension i of the saddle x for f , then y is also the strong stable manifold of dimension i of the saddle x for g .*

6.2. Proof of Theorem 3. Fix $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{p,\epsilon}$ be the set of diffeomorphisms f such that for any periodic saddle point x of period p , if the homoclinic class of x has no dominated splitting of same index as x , then there is a saddle y in the homoclinic class of x with same index as x that has a minimum stable/unstable angle less than ϵ and pairwise distinct real eigenvalues of moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} .

Lemma 6.3. *For all $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the set $\mathcal{S}_{p,\epsilon}$ contains an open and dense set in $\text{Diff}^1(M)$.*

Proof of Theorem 3: Take the residual set $\mathcal{R} = \bigcap_{p,n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{S}_{p, \frac{1}{n+1}}$. □

Proof of Lemma 6.3: By the Kupka-Smale Theorem, there is a residual set $\mathcal{R}$ of diffeomorphism whose periodic points are all hyperbolic, and consequently that have a finite number of periodic points of period p . Let $f \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_l$ be all the hyperbolic points of period p for f , with $x_1, \dots, x_k$ (for some $k \leq l$) being the saddle points of period p . There is a neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f such that, for all $g \in \mathcal{U}$, the saddle points of period p for g are given by the continuations $x_1(g), \dots, x_k(g)$ of the saddles $x_1, \dots, x_k$ of f .

Claim 4. *There is an open and dense subset $\mathcal{V}_k$ of $\mathcal{U}$ such that, for all $g \in \mathcal{V}$, the homoclinic class of the continuation of $x_k(g)$ either admits a dominated splitting of same index as x_k , or contains a saddle of same index as x_k that has a minimum stable/unstable angle less than ϵ and pairwise distinct real eigenvalues of moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} .*

Proof. Let $\Delta \subset \mathcal{U}$ be the set of diffeomorphisms such that the homoclinic class of the continuation $x_k(g)$ does not admit a dominated splitting of same index as x_k , and let $\Delta_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{U}$ be the open set of diffeomorphisms such that that homoclinic class

contains a saddle of same index as x_k that has a stable/unstable angle strictly less than ϵ and pairwise distinct real eigenvalues of moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} . Let $f \in \Delta$. Obviously, the homoclinic class of $x_k(f)$ cannot be reduced to $x_k(f)$.

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a periodic point y_N in that homoclinic class that has same index as x_k , that has period greater than N , and such that the stable/unstable splitting above the orbit of y_N is not N -dominated. By Proposition 6.2, there is an arbitrarily small perturbation of g that turns the minimum stable/unstable angle of some iterate of y_N to be strictly less than ϵ , and that turns the eigenvalues of y_N to be real, pairwise distinct with moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} , while preserving the dynamics and the local (strong) stable and unstable manifolds of y_N outside of an arbitrarily small neighbourhood of y_N . In particular, one can do that perturbation preserving the homoclinic relation between y_N and $x_k(g)$: one finds an arbitrarily small perturbation of $g \in \Delta$ in Δ_ϵ .

Now the union $\mathcal{V}_k$ of Δ_ϵ and the interior of the complement set of Δ in $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies all the conclusions of the claim. $\square$

Taking the union of all the intersections $\cap_{1 \leq I \leq k} \mathcal{V}_i$, for all $f \in \mathcal{R}$, one gets an open and dense subset of $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ that is a subset of $\mathcal{S}_{p,\epsilon}$. This ends the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

6.3. Linear cocycles and dominated splittings. Here we recall notations and tools from [3] and [5]. Let $\pi: E \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a vector bundle of dimension d above a compact base $\mathcal{B}$ such that, for any point $x \in \mathcal{B}$, the fiber E_x above x is a d -dimensional vector space endowed with a Euclidean metric $\|\cdot\|$. One identifies each $x \in \mathcal{B}$ with the zeros of the corresponding fiber E_x . A *linear cocycle* $\mathcal{A}$ on E is a bijection of E that sends each fiber E_x on its image by a linear isomorphism. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *bounded* by $C > 1$, if for any unit vector $v \in E$, we have $C^{-1} < \|\mathcal{A}(v)\| < C$.

In the following, a *subbundle* $F \subset E$, is a vector bundle with same base $\mathcal{B}$ as E such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}$, the fibers F_x and F_y have same dimension. One defines then the *quotient vector bundle* E/F as the bundle of base $\mathcal{B}$ such that the fiber $(E/F)_x$ above x is the set $\{e_x + F_x, e_x \in E_x\}$ of affine subspaces of E_x directed by F_x . The bundle F is endowed with the restricted metric $\|\cdot\|_F$ and the norm of any element $e_x + F_x$ of E/F is defined by the minimum of the norms of the vectors of $e_x + F_x$. If G is another subbundle of E , then one defines the vector subbundle $G/F \subset E/F$ as the image of G by the canonical projection $E \rightarrow E/F$.

If F is a subbundle invariant for the linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ (that is, $\mathcal{A}(F) = F$), then $\mathcal{A}$ induces canonically a *restricted cocycle* $\mathcal{A}|_F$, and a *quotient cocycle* $\mathcal{A}_F$ defined on the quotient E/F by $\mathcal{A}_F(e_x + F_x) = \mathcal{A}(e_x + F_x) = \mathcal{A}(e_x) + F_{\mathcal{A}(x)}$. If G is another invariant subbundle, then G/F is an invariant subbundle for $\mathcal{A}_F$.

Remark 6.4. If $\mathcal{A}$ is bounded by some constant $C > 1$, then so are the restriction $\mathcal{A}|_F$ and the quotient $\mathcal{A}_F$.

We use the natural notions of transverse subbundles and direct sum of transverse subbundles. The following definition generalizes the definition given in the previous section for diffeomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a linear cocycle on a bundle E , and let $E = F \oplus G$ a splitting into two subbundles invariant by $\mathcal{A}$. It is a *dominated splitting* if and only if there exists N such that, for any point $x \in K$, for any unit

vectors $u \in E_x, v \in F_x$ in the tangent fiber above x , we have

$$\|\mathcal{A}^N(u)\| < 1/2 \cdot \|\mathcal{A}^N(v)\|.$$

Given such N , one says that the splitting $TM|_K = E \oplus F$ is N -dominated. The strength of a dominated splitting is given by the minimum of such N . The bigger that minimum, the weaker the domination.

6.4. 'Pathwise' perturbation results on cocycles. A few perturbation results on cocycles are proved in [5] and [8]. Here we want to show that these perturbations can actually be reached through paths of cocycles that satisfy good properties. Namely properties that will put us under the assumptions of Theorem 1.

To any sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ of matrices of $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ one canonically associates the linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ on the bundle $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ that sends the i -th fiber on the $(i+1)$ -th fiber by the linear map of matrix A_i , and that sends the p -th fiber on the first by A_p . We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is a *saddle cocycle* if and only all the moduli of the eigenvalues of the product $A_p \times \dots \times A_1$ are different from 1, and if there are some that are greater than 1 and others that are less than 1. The splitting $\mathcal{E} = E^s \oplus E^u$ into the stable bundle E^s and the unstable one E^u is called the *stable/unstable splitting*.

Notice that Theorem 2 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 1 and the following proposition about getting real eigenvalues:

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\epsilon, C > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ of length $p \geq N$ of matrices in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ all bounded by C (i.e. $\|A_i\|, \|A_i^{-1}\| < C$), it holds:*

For each $1 \leq k \leq p$, there is a path $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ such that

- *the p -uple $(A_{1,0}, \dots, A_{p,0})$ is equal to $(A_1, \dots, A_p)$.*
- *For all $t \in [0, 1]$, the moduli of the eigenvalues of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,t}$ (counted with multiplicity) are equal to those of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,0}$ and the eigenvalues of $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,1}$ are real.*
- *The radii of the paths $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ are less than ϵ , that is,*

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, p, t \in [0,1]} \left\{ \|A_{k,t} - A_{k,0}\|, \|A_{k,t}^{-1} - A_{k,0}^{-1}\| \right\} < \epsilon.$$

The second Proposition is about getting eigenvalues that all have moduli less than ϵ or more than ϵ^{-1} .

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\epsilon, C > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ of length $p \geq N$ of matrices in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ all bounded by C , if the moduli of the eigenvalues of the product $\prod A_k$ are pairwise distinct, then it holds:*

for each $1 \leq k \leq p$, there is a path $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ such that

- *the p -uple $(A_{1,0}, \dots, A_{p,0})$ is equal to $(A_1, \dots, A_p)$.*
- *For all $t \in [0, 1]$, the moduli of the eigenvalues of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,t}$ are pairwise distinct and different from 1 and the eigenvalues of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,1}$ have moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} .*
- *The radii of the paths $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ are less than ϵ .*

The third one is about obtaining a small angle in the absence of dominated splitting:

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\epsilon, C > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ of length $p \geq N$ of matrices in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies the following:*

- *if the corresponding linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ is bounded by C ,*
- *if it is a saddle cocycle whose stable/unstable splitting is not N -dominated,*
- *if the eigenvalues of the product $A_p \times \dots \times A_1$ are all real,*

then, for each $1 \leq k \leq p$, there is a path $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ such that

- *the p -uple $(A_{1,0}, \dots, A_{p,0})$ is equal to $(A_1, \dots, A_p)$.*
- *For all $t \in [0, 1]$, the eigenvalues of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,t}$ (counted with multiplicity) are equal to those of the product $\prod_{k=1, \dots, p} A_{k,0}$.*
- *The stable/unstable splitting of the cocycle given by $A_{1,0}, \dots, A_{p,1}$ has a minimum angle less than ϵ .*
- *The radii of the paths $\{A_{k,t}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ are less than ϵ .*

Proof of Proposition 6.2: Since it poses no difficulty, we only sketch it. One first applies Proposition 6.5 to obtain a path that joins the cocycle corresponding to the derivative $Df|_X$ along the orbit X of x to a cocycle such that its eigenvalues are all real. Then adding an arbitrarily small path, one may suppose that the moduli of these eigenvalues are pairwise distinct. With Proposition 6.6, we prolong that path to obtain eigenvalues that have moduli less than ϵ or greater than ϵ^{-1} . Remember that a weak dominated splitting remains a weak dominated splitting after perturbation, if it still exists. Hence, we can use Proposition 6.7 to get a small angle. This provides us a path of small radius that joins the initial derivative to a cocycle that has all wanted properties. One finally applies Theorem 1 to conclude the proof. $\square$

6.4.1. *Proof of Proposition 6.5.* First notice that in dimension $d = 2$, the Proposition is an easy consequence of [2, lemme 6.6] restated below:

Lemma 6.8 (Bonatti, Crovisier). *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that, for any integer $p \geq N(\epsilon)$ and any finite sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ of elements in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, there exists a sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$ in $] -\epsilon, \epsilon[$ such that the following assertion holds:*
for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ if we denote by $B_i = R_{\alpha_i} \circ A_i$ the composition of A_i with the rotation R_{α_i} of angle α_i , then the matrix $B_p \circ B_{p-1} \circ \dots \circ B_0$ has real eigenvalues.

Under the hypothesis of the lemma, let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$ be a corresponding sequence. For all $1 \leq i \leq p$, define $A_{t,i} = R_{t \cdot \alpha_i} \circ A_i$, and let t_0 be the least positive number such that the matrix $A_{t,p} \circ \dots \circ B_{t,0}$ has real eigenvalues. Then the paths $\{A_{t,p}\}_{t \in [0, t_0]}$ give a candidate for the conclusion of Proposition 6.5 in dimension 2.

Proof of Proposition 6.5 in any dimensions. Consider the linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ associated to the sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ on the bundle $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. If some eigenvalue of the product $A_p \cdots A_1$, that is the first return map, is not real, there is a dimension 2 invariant subbundle F of $\mathcal{E}$ that corresponds to that eigenvalue. Choosing orthonormal basis in each fibre of F and completing by a basis of the orthonormal bundle $F^\perp$, the linear automorphism $\mathcal{A}$ writes in those basis in blocks of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{|F,i} & B \\ 0 & A_{|F^\perp,i}^\perp \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the proposition in dimension 2, one may choose a path $\mathcal{A}_{|F,t}$ of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$ ending at $\mathcal{A}_{|F}$ such that the first return map of $\mathcal{A}_{|F,0}$ has real eigenvalues.

Denote by $\mathcal{A}_t$ the automorphism that writes in blocks of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A|_{F,t,i} & B \\ 0 & A_{F,i}^\perp \end{pmatrix}.$$

This defines a path of small radius that joins the initial automorphism to an automorphism where two of the eigenvalues have turned real. The other eigenvalues are given by the product of the blocks $A_{F,i}^\perp$, therefore did not change. One may need to iterate that process at most $d/2$ times to turn all eigenvalues real, by concatenation of small path. This ends the proof of the proposition. $\square$

6.4.2. Proof of Proposition 6.6. As in the previous proof, one considers the linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ associated to the sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ on the bundle $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\mathcal{E} = E^s \oplus E^u$ be the stable/unstable splitting for the cocycle $\mathcal{A}$. Choosing an orthonormal basis in each fibre of E^s and completing by a basis of the orthonormal bundle $E^{s\perp}$, the linear automorphism $\mathcal{A}$ writes in those basis in blocks of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A|_{E^s,i} & B \\ 0 & A_{E^s,i}^\perp \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $0 < t \leq 1$. Let $\mathcal{A}_t$ be the cocycle obtained from $\mathcal{A}$ multiplying each matrix $A|_{E^s,i}$ by $t^{1/p}$. One easily checks that the stable eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_t$ are those of $\mathcal{A}$ multiplied by t , while the unstable eigenvalues remain unchanged. All stable eigenvalues for $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ are less than ϵ and, for p big, the path $\{\mathcal{A}_t\}_{t \in [\epsilon, 1]}$ is small. One can do the same for the unstable eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ and obtain another path. The concatenation of both paths ends the proof of the proposition.

6.4.3. Proof of Proposition 6.7. We show it by induction on the dimension d . We first restate [3, Lemma 4.4]:

Lemma 6.9 (Bonatti, Díaz, Pujals). *Let $C > 1$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists an application $\phi_{C,d}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that tends to infinity such that, for any linear cocycle $\mathcal{A}$ bounded by C on a d -dimensional bundle E , the following holds: if an invariant splitting $E = F \oplus G$ is not N -dominated for $\mathcal{A}$, and if $H \subset F$ (resp. $H \subset G$) is an invariant subbundle, then*

- *either the splitting $H \oplus G$ (resp. $F \oplus H$) is not $\phi_{C,d}(N)$ -dominated for the restriction $\mathcal{A}|_{H \oplus G}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}|_{F \oplus H}$),*
- *or $F/H \oplus G/H$ is not $\phi_{C,d}(N)$ -dominated for the quotient $\mathcal{A}/_H$.*

Proof in dimension 2: This is basically [3, Lemma 7.10] by isotopy. Notice that the perturbations done in the proof of that Lemma can be obtained by an isotopy such that at each time, two invariant bundles exist. The eigenvalues may be slightly modified along that isotopy, however each eigenvalue may be retrieved by dilating or contracting normally to the other eigendirection (which preserves the other eigenvalue). $\square$

Proof in any dimension: Fix $d > 2$, and assume that the proposition is proved in all dimensions less than d . Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the cocycle associated to the sequence $A_1, \dots, A_p$ on the bundle $\mathcal{E} = \{1, \dots, p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\mathcal{E} = E^s \oplus E^u$ be the stable/unstable splitting. One of these two bundles has dimension greater or equal to 2, we assume it is E^s (the other case is symmetrical). Since the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}$ are real, there is a proper invariant subbundle $F \subset E^s$. If the stable/unstable splitting $E^s \oplus E^u$ is not N -dominated, by Lemma 6.9, either $H = F \oplus E^u$ is not $\phi_{C,d}(N)$ -dominated for the restriction $\mathcal{A}|_H$, or $E^s/F \oplus E^u/F$ is not $\phi_{C,d}(N)$ -dominated for $\mathcal{A}/_F$. Since

$\phi_{C,d}(n) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$, one may choose N big enough so that the induction hypothesis applies with $N' = \phi_{C,d'}(N)$ for all $2 \leq d' < d$. Hence for such N , one has either:

- a path $\mathcal{A}_{|H,t}$ of radius $\leq \epsilon$ that joins $\mathcal{A}_{|H}$ to a saddle cocycle that has a minimum stable/unstable angle less than ϵ , and such that the eigenvalues are preserved all along the path. One may extend that path to a path $\mathcal{A}_t$ of saddle cocycles on $\mathcal{E}$ as we did in the proof of Proposition 6.5. That path has same radius, the minimum stable/unstable angle of each $\mathcal{A}_t$ is less or equal to that of $\mathcal{A}_{|H,t}$ for each t , in particular that of $\mathcal{A}_1$ is less than ϵ , and the eigenvalues are the same for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_t$.
- or a path $\mathcal{A}_{/F,t}$ of radius $\leq \epsilon$ that joins $\mathcal{A}_{/F}$ to a saddle cocycle that has a minimum stable/unstable angle less than ϵ , and such that the eigenvalues are preserved all along the path. Choosing an orthonormal basis in each fibre of F and completing by a basis of the orthonormal bundle $F^\perp$, the linear automorphism $\mathcal{A}$ writes in those basis in blocks of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{|F,i} & B \\ 0 & A_{F,i}^\perp \end{pmatrix},$$

where the sequence of matrices $A_{F,i}^\perp$ actually identifies with $\mathcal{A}_{/F}$. We define a path $\mathcal{A}_t$ replacing the sequence $A_{F,i}^\perp$ by the sequence $A_{F,t,i}^\perp$ that corresponds to the cocycle $\mathcal{A}_{/F,t}$. Let $\mathcal{E} = E_t^s \oplus E_t^u$ be the stable/unstable splitting for $\mathcal{A}_t$. By construction F is a subbundle of E_t^s and is invariant by $\mathcal{A}_t$. The stable/unstable splitting of $\mathcal{A}_{t/F}$, which identifies to $\mathcal{A}_{/F,t}$, is $\mathcal{E}/H = E_t^s/F \oplus E_t^u/F$. Note that, given three vector subspaces $\Gamma \subset \Delta$ and Λ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, one has the following relation on minimum angles:

$$\angle(\Delta, \Lambda) \leq \angle(\Delta/\Gamma, \Lambda/\Gamma).$$

Therefore, the minimum stable/unstable angle of each $\mathcal{A}_t$ is less than that of $\mathcal{A}_{/F,t}$, in particular, that of $\mathcal{A}_1$ is less than ϵ . The radius of the path $\mathcal{A}_t$ is the same as for the quotient and the eigenvalues are the same for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_t$.

We are done in both case, which ends the proof of Proposition 6.7. $\square$

7. Further results and announcements. In this paper, we assume that some i -strong stable/unstable directions exists at any time t of the homotopy, and we obtain a perturbation lemma that preserves the corresponding local invariant manifolds entirely, outside of small neighbourhoods.

We announce a 'manifolds prescribing pathwise Franks Lemma', that is, a generalisation of Theorem 1 that allows to prescribe the strong stable/unstable manifolds within any 'admissible' flag of stable/unstable manifolds. That generalisation implies for instance that if the i -strong stable direction exists for all the cocycles γ_t , for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, and if, for some time t_0 , all the eigenvalues inside the i -strong stable direction have same moduli, then one can do the pathwise Franks' lemma, prescribing the j -strong stable manifolds, for all $j \leq i$, inside arbitrarily large annuli of fundamental domains of i -strong stable manifold.

Let us formally define these objects. Let f be a C^1 -diffeomorphism and x be a periodic saddle point for f . To simplify the statement, we assume that x is a fixed point. Given a fundamental domain of the stable/unstable manifold of x identified diffeomorphically to $\mathbb{S}^{i_s-1} \times [0, 1[$, an *annulus* $A(f, x)$ is a subset of the form $\mathbb{S}^{i_s-1} \times [0, \rho[$, where $0 < \rho < 1$. We denote by $W^{s,i}(f)$ the i -strong stable manifold of

f . An i -admissible flag of manifolds for f is a flag $W^{s,1} \subset \dots \subset W^{s,i} = W^{s,i}(f)$ of f -invariant manifolds such that each $W^{s,k}$ is an immersed boundaryless k -dimensional manifold that contains x . A particular case (and simple case) of the announced Franks' Lemma that prescribes manifolds can be stated as follows:

Theorem. Assume that $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is a path that starts at the sequence of matrices $\mathcal{A}_0$ corresponding to the derivative of f . Assume that, for all t , the corresponding first return map has an i -strong stable direction. Assume also that there is some time t_0 such that the i strongest stable eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$ of $\mathcal{A}_{t_0}$, counted with multiplicity, have same moduli. Then, for any i -admissible flag $W^{s,1} \subset \dots \subset W^{s,i}$ for f , for any annulus $A(f, x)$, for any neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the orbit of x , there is a diffeomorphism g such that it holds:

- g is a perturbation of f whose size can be found arbitrarily small to the radius of the path $\mathcal{A}_t$,
- $g = f$ on the orbit of x and outside of $\mathcal{U}$,
- the sequence of matrices $\mathcal{A}_1$ corresponds to the derivative $Dg|_X$,
- For all $1 \leq j \leq i$, if g has a j -strong stable manifold, then it coincides with $W^{s,j}$ by restriction to the annulus $A(f, x)$.

The perturbation techniques for linear cocycles as developed in [10, 3, 5], successively, can be easily rewritten in order to take into account the need of a good path between the initial cocycle and the perturbation. The perturbations of cocycles obtained by the techniques of [5] can indeed be done along paths whose size are small.² These pathwise perturbation lemmas for cocycles³ and the manifolds prescribing Franks' Lemma lead to easy and systematic ways to create strong connections and heterodimensional cycles whenever there is some lack of domination within a homoclinic class.⁴

We claim that with some hypothesis on the signs of the eigenvalues of the first return map of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and on the behaviour of the eigenvalues along the path, with the help of some elementary algebraic geometry, the theorem above can be adapted to prescribe all the flag of strong stable manifolds outside of $\mathcal{U}$, and not only an annulus of it.

Finally, we claim that these results, with some work and excluding the codimension one manifolds, can be adapted to hold in the volume preserving and symplectic settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.-C. Arnaud, *Création de connexions en topologie C^1* , Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **21**(2001), 339-381.
- [2] C. Bonatti and S. Crovisier, *Réurrence et genericité*, Invent. Math **158**(2004), 33-104.

²R. Potrie actually already wrote a proof of it in [11].

³With J. Bochi and C. Bonatti, we believe that we can describe the set of d -uples of Lyapunov exponents that are reachable by pathwise small perturbations of cocycles according to the strength of the dominated splittings that may exist along the periodic orbits.

⁴Shinohara Katsutoshi claimed very recently that in complete absence of dominated splittings on a homoclinic class of a periodic saddle point x , he can build a perturbation of the dynamics such that the first return dynamics is a homothety by restriction respectively to a disk centered on x of the stable (resp. unstable) manifold of x . This implies that he can create heterodimensional cycles, under some volume expansion or volume contraction on the derivative of a saddle point of the homoclinic class.

- [3] C. Bonatti and L.J. Diaz and E.R. Pujals, *A C^1 -generic dichotomy for diffeomorphisms: weak forms of hyperbolicity or infinitely many sinks or sources*, Ann. of Math., **158** (2000), 355-418.
- [4] C. Bonatti and L.J. Diaz and M. Viana, "Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity," Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [5] C. Bonatti and N. Gourmelon and T. Vivier, *Perturbations of the derivative along periodic orbits*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **26** (2006), 1307-1337.
- [6] S. Crovisier, *Periodic orbits and chain transitive sets of C^1 -diffeomorphisms*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., **104** (2006), 87-141.
- [7] J. Franks, *Necessary conditions for stability of diffeomorphisms*, Transactions of the A.M.S., **158** (1971), 302-304.
- [8] N. Gourmelon, *Generation of homoclinic tangencies by C^1 -perturbations*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, **26** (2010).
- [9] S. Hayashi, *Connecting invariant manifolds and the solution of the C^1 -stability and Ω -stability conjectures for flows*, Ann. of Math., **145**(2000), 81-137.
- [10] R. Mañé, *An ergodic closing lemma*, Ann. of Math., **116** (1982), 503-540.
- [11] R. Potrie, *Generic bi-Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes*, preprint [arXiv:0903.4090v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/0903.4090v2).
- [12] C. Pugh, *The closing lemma*, Amer. J. Math., **89**(1967), 956-1009.
- [13] E.R. Pujals and M. Sambarino, *Homoclinic tangencies and hyperbolicity for surface diffeomorphisms*, Ann. of Math., **151** (2000), 961-1023.
- [14] L. Wen, *Homoclinic tangencies and dominated splittings*, Nonlinearity, **15** (2002), 1445-1469.
- [15] L. Wen and Z. Xia, *C^1 connecting lemmas*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **352** (2000), no.11, 5213-5230.
- [16] J. Yang, *Lyapunov stable chain-recurrent classes*, preprint, [arXiv:0712.0514v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/0712.0514v1).

E-mail address: ngourmel@math.u-bordeaux1.fr